

**REMARKS**

Claims 11 through 14 and 16 through 21 are pending in this application. Claims 11 through 14, 16 and 18 through 21 have been amended and claims 10 and 15 cancelled. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Applicants note that claim 14, indicated allowable, has been placed in independent form and claims 11 through 13 made dependent thereon, and that claim 16, indicated allowable, has been placed in independent form with claim 17 dependent thereon and claims 18 through 21 made dependent thereon. Applicant submits that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

**Claim 18 was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.**

In the statement of the rejection the Examiner identified a perceived lack of literal antecedent basis. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 18 has been made dependent upon claim 16 which contains antecedent basis support for the first and second stations mentioned in claim 18, thereby overcoming the stated basis for the imposed rejection.

Applicant, therefore, submits that the imposed rejection of claim 18 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is not viable, and hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

**Claims 10 through 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for lack of novelty as evidenced by Onaka et al.**

**Claims 13, 15, 18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness predicated upon Onaka et al. in view of Ishikawa.**

Each of the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 is traverse. Indeed, each of the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been rendered moot, because claim 10 has been cancelled, claims 11 and 12 made dependent upon claim 14, indicated allowable, and claim 19 has been made dependent upon claim 16, indicated allowable, thereby overcoming the imposed rejection of 35 U.S.C. § 102, and because claim 13 has been made dependent upon claim 14, indicated allowable, claim 15 cancelled, and claims 18, 20 and 21 made dependent upon claim 16, indicated allowable, thereby overcoming the imposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As previously noted, claims 14 and 16 have been placed in independent form.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant submits that the imposed rejection of claims 10 through 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for lack of novelty as evidenced by Onaka et al., and the imposed rejection of claims 13, 15, 18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness predicated upon Onaka et al. in view of Ishikawa, are not viable and, hence, solicits withdrawal thereof.


In summary, claims 14 and 16, each indicated allowable, have been placed in independent form with the remaining claims dependent thereon. Based upon the foregoing Applicant submits that the imposed objection and rejections have been overcome, and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

No.: 10/788,434

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Arthur J. Steiner  
Registration No. 26,106

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
202.756.8000 AJS:MWE:ntb  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 3, 2004**

WDC99 993075-1.050212.0573